

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-17 stand rejected and Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

1. Objections to the Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to Claim 7 as containing an informality. Applicants respectfully point out that the Examiner's objection to the word "comprises" should be withdrawn, as the previous amendment to Claim 7 also added the word "wherein". Therefore the clause now reads "wherein said differential comparator comprises", which Applicants believe is correct.

2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

In particular, the Examiner indicated that it is misdescriptive to recite the reference combiner and single-ended comparator as separate elements in Claim 1, because the reference combiner is part of the single-ended comparator. Applicants respectfully disagree. As applicants' representative pointed out in

the above-recorded interview, the reference combination function in Figure 3B is performed by transistors N11 and N12 and the comparison function is performed by transistor N13. Applicants further note that the single-ended comparator element of Claim 1 is not the "singlential" comparator referred to in the specification, which does include the reference combiner, but rather is the portion of the (singlential) comparator circuit of Claim 1 that performs the comparison function, as opposed to the reference combining function. Therefore, applicants believe that the rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Primary Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Andoh. The Primary Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Alexander.

In the Interview recorded above, the Examiner has now indicated that neither Andoh nor Alexander disclose or suggest a single-ended data signal and therefore Applicants believe that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome.

Therefore, for all of the reasons stated above, applicants believe that all of the rejections and objections have been overcome.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment, in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that they have persuasively demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

No fees should be incurred by this Amendment, but if there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from IBM Deposit Account NO. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew M. Harris
Reg. No. 42,638
(706)-782-9683

Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.
4204 North Brown Ave.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

AUS920010256US2-AMDC.